

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and removal of the grounds for rejection are respectfully requested. Claims 21 and 22-40 were in the application, claims 21, 27 and 29 have been amended, and claims 35-40 were withdrawn.

The examiner rejected claim 27 as lacking proper antecedent basis, and claim 29 as being unclear as to the alternative "skirt" language. Both claims have been amended to correct these deficiencies, rendering moot their rejection.

Claims 21, 23, 24, 26 and 27 were rejected as being anticipated by Mariutti. To have anticipation, each and every element of the claim must be found in a single prior art reference W.L. Gore & Assoc. V. Garlock, Inc. 721 F.2d. 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Further the reference must describe the claimed invention sufficiently to place a person of ordinary skill in the art in possession of the invention, In re Spada, 15 USPQ 2d (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Claims 21 has been amended to clarify that the grinding ring inner circumferential surface defines an opening within which the restraining boss resides. Figures 3-6 illustrate how the restraining boss is received within the opening and surrounded by the inner circumferential surface of the grinding ring, the boss preventing the grinding ring from contacting the side wall of the bowl.

That the grinding ring does not contact the bowl side wall distinguishes from Mariutti, as in Mariutti, no restraining boss is present. To the contrary, the prior art relies on the grinding action between "the grinding disk and the annular wall of the grinding barrel body." Col. 1, L. 34-36, and the cited patent shows quite clearly in Fig. 3, that the disk 34 engages the grinding disk body 22. In fact, Mariutti does not show a grinding "ring". There is no inner circumferential surface that defines an opening for receiving a restraining boss. There is only a bottom wall of a grinding disk. The raised surface portion 38 of the bottom wall 26 does not restrain movement of the grinding disk, but is only a complimentary surface to the contour of the grinding disk, with the grinding disk contacting this as well as the bowl side wall.

On the other hand, the boss of applicants invention restrains the grinding ring so as to leave a space between the grinding ring and the side wall of the bowl so that the side wall is

not subject to high wear rates. This is illustrated in Figs. 3-9, 19 and 20 of the application.


As each and every element of the claim is not found in Mariutti, claims 21, 23, 24, 26 and 27 are not anticipated thereby.

Claim 25 was rejected as being obvious over Mariutti in view of Hobson, U.S. Patent no. 5,556,044. However, the rejection is based on the premise that Mariutti discloses a grinding ring, and no such ring is present, as discussed above. Since claim 25 contains each and every element of claim 21 therein, claim 25 is similarly believed patentable over the art cited.

Claims 28-34 were rejected as being obvious over Mariutti. However, these claims depend from and contain all the elements of claim 21 therein, and further, there is no teaching, suggestion or inference in Mariutti for utilizing a restraining boss and grinding ring as discussed above where the ring is prevented from contacting the side wall of the bowl. Rather, the contrary is true: Mariutti teaches the use of such contact for grinding materials, and therefore teaches away from the present invention.

Based on the above amendment and remarks, favorable consideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested. However should the examiner believe that direct contact with the applicant's attorney would advance the prosecution of the application, the examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



William J. Sapone  
Registration No. 32,518  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

COLEMAN SUDOL SAPONE P.C.  
714 Colorado Avenue  
Bridgeport CT 06605  
Phone: (203) 366-3560  
Fax: (203) 335-6779